

### REMARKS

Applicant thanks the examiner for the examiner's time and helpful comments during the July 10, 2006, and the August 4, 2006, telephone interviews to discuss the claims and the June 20, 2006, Advisory Action. Applicant and the examiner discussed adding the limitations of the claims 2 and 3 to independent claim 1 to put the application in condition for allowance. No immediate agreement was reached

Claims 1-25 are pending in the above-referenced patent application. Claims 1, 15, 22 and 24 are independent. Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-14 and 21 have been deemed allowable.

The examiner stated in the office action:

20. Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. None of the prior art of record further teaches the voluntary parameter for swapping out if another thread is ready to run, and if the thread is swapped, the swapped thread is automatically re-enabled to run at some subsequent context arbitration point. (Office Action, page 5)

Applicant amended independent claim 1 to include features similar to those recited in allowable claim 9 and intervening claims 2 and 3. Applicant believes that independent claim 1 is thus allowable. Claims 2, 3 and 9 have been cancelled.

Applicant also amended independent claims 15, 22, and 24 to include features similar to those recited in independent claim 1. Additionally, applicant amended independent claims 15, 22 and 24 to remove the feature pertaining to "evaluating a specified parameter." Claims 17, 23 and 25 have been cancelled.

Thus, independent claim 15, 22 and 24 recite "receiving an indication of a voluntary swap, the voluntary swap specified as a parameter in a context-swap instruction; performing, in response to the received indication, a swapping operation to cause an executing context process corresponding to a first thread to be swapped with a different context and associated program counter, corresponding to a different thread, the swapped first thread is automatically re-enabled to run at some subsequent context arbitration point; and waking up the swapped out context when the voluntary swap parameter specified in the context-swap instruction is activated, with the parameter specifying an occurrence of an event," or similar language. Independent claims 15, 22 and 24 are therefore allowable for at least similar reasons as those indicated by the examiner in the office action in relation to allowable claim 9.

Claims 4-8, 10-13 and 18-20 have been amended to clarify that the various parameters recited therein are types of voluntary swap parameters.

Claims 4-8 and 10-14 were also amended to correct their dependency. Claims 4-8, 10-13 and 18-20 were further amended for greater clarity, to correct various antecedent problems and/or to make the language recited therein consistent with the amended language of the claims' respective independent claims.

Additionally, claims 14 and 21 were amended for greater clarity.

Claims 4-8 and 10-14 depend from allowable independent claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. Claims 16 and 18-21 depend from allowable claim 15 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 15.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the examiner's earliest convenience.

It is believed that all the rejections and/or objections raised by the examiner have been addressed.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Gilbert Wolrich et al.  
Serial No. : 10/069,306  
Filed : July 3, 2002  
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-303US1 / P9624US

Applicants enclose a Petition for One Month Extension of Time. The fees in the amount of \$790 and \$120 are being paid concurrently on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other required fees to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above..

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Aug. 9, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ido Rabinovitch', written over a horizontal line.

Ido Rabinovitch  
Attorney for Intel Corporation  
Reg. No. L0080

Customer No. 20985  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906